A Parliamentary Government was, the Member contended, wholly inapplicable to the conditions of Travancore and the only possible and efficacious substitute for a Second Chamber in an Indian State was a small official majority. If any check from the general public was deemed necessary against the abuse of power resulting from the official majority, there was the possibility of such abuse of power being exposed and mercilessly criticised in the press and on the platform.

The Member then referred to another criticism against the Regulation, namely, that the Council had not been given power to move resolutions and to ask supplementary questions and that it was not desirable to restrict the number of questions to be asked at a Session to three. That was a matter worthy of the sympathetic consideration of Government. In regard to that, however, they fully relied on the assurance given by the Dewan in his speeches delivered in the Council that the grant of further privileges would, in a large measure, depend upon the non-official members themselves.

The Member added that it was their earnest and heart-felt prayer that Government should not mistake the voice of a few for the avowed opinion of the majority, and reiterated that the heart of Travancore was still sound and that even in the days of new-fangled notions of license and liberty, she was not wholly bereft of the old-world sentiments of loyalty and gratitude.

Dewan's reply.—The suggestions of the Members will be carefully considered by Government.

37. Amendment of the rules regarding the election of Jenmi members to the Legislative Council so as to afford more facilities to the members in the matter of voting.

Mr. Devan Vasudevan Nambiathiri (Member, Jenmi, Kottayam Division) conveyed the grateful acknowledgments of the Jenmis for the privilege of a Member granted to the community and added that, even with that privilege, their interests would suffer when the Jenmi-Kudiyan Regulation was taken up for amendment, if the existing arrangements were to continue. For, numerically the representatives of Kudiyans were larger in the Council. The remedy suggested by the Member was that the non-officials who practically represented the Kudiyans should have only one combined vote, so as to equalise the votes of the Jenmis and the Kudiyans. He further requested that the officials should be allowed to vote as they liked and their votes should also be taken into account in counting the majority.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

38. Amendment of the Legislative Council Regulation, I of 1095, so as to make provision for a Member elected by the Kudiyans and a separate member for the Kottayam Division alone.

Mr. Ousep Ulahannan (Member, Ettumanur taluk) expressed the grateful and loyal thanks of the people of the taluk for the reform of the Legislative Council and said that the majority of the agriculturists being Kudiyans enjoying the properties of Jenmis and Devaswoms, the Kudiyans should be given the privilege of representation in the Council, especially in view of such a right having been granted to the Jenmis who, numerically, were not as large as the Kudiyans. The Kudiyans might be given at least one seat for the whole State. His second request was that the Kottayam Division alone might be given at least one Member to the Council and not the Kottayam and Devicolam Divisions together as laid down in the present rules.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

(2) Civil Justice.

39. Judicial Reforms.

Mr. A. Ananthapadmanabha Iyer (Member, Parur taluk) suggested the following reforms :—

(1) Extension of Panchayat Courts and enhancement of their territorial and pecuniary jurisdictions. At present the territorial jurisdiction of the Panchayat Courts was the same as that of the Towns under the Towns Conservancy and Improvement Regulation and that did not benefit the people much or afford relief to the Munsiffs. More courts should be established in rural areas with powers of control

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly